

### **REMARKS**

Claims 21-32 were pending in the application and all were rejected. Applicant has amended claims 21, 25, 26, and 27. Support for the claim amendments can be found in Applicant's specification as published in United States Publication No. 2008/0227433, specifically at paragraphs [0042], [0045], [0048], [0049], and [0061]. The drawing sheets have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

### **DRAWINGS**

The Office Action objected to the replacement drawings filed on March 25, 2009 because FIGs 1 and 6 are not sufficiently legible. Accordingly, Applicant is submitting replacement drawing sheets illustrated by a professional draftsman. Please cancel the previous replacement sheets and replace with the appended drawing sheets.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112**

**The Office Action rejected claims 21, 25-27 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.**

As to section 6 on page 3, the Office Action alleges that the limitation "in response to the user interaction" lacks antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The antecedent for "the user interaction" is at line 24 in the previous limitation: "presenting the generated message page on the display for user interaction."

Claims 25, 26, and 27 have been amended to correct the antecedent basis issues brought up in sections 7, 8, and 9 of the Office Action.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102**

**The Office Action rejected claims 21-31 under 35 USC 102(b)** as being anticipated by US Pub 20020029243 to Melet et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and states the following in support thereof:

Melet's invention concerns matching interactive dialog boxes to the Web page in which the boxes are displayed. [See Melet p. 28] The instant invention as embodied by claim 21 recites a terminal for processing a received multimedia message, and separating the presentation from the content so that a multiplex is allowed to support more powerful input functions. This is achieved in one respect by splitting the multimedia message into three parts as recited by claim 21 (and amended to further clarify): "corresponding rules governing the plurality of control elements; a parser module operable for splitting the multimedia message into three parts by: parsing the multimedia message to separate the presentation portion of the multimedia message; parsing the separated presentation portion to generate a presentation structure governing how to present the multimedia message; parsing the corresponding rules to separate them from the multimedia message."

The Examiner relies on Melet's discussion of HTML tags to provide a similarity to the bi-level parsing of claim 21. Refer to Melet at paragraph [0013]: "HTML (HyperText

Markup Language). A standard coding convention and set of codes for attaching presentation and linking attributes to informational content within documents. (HTML 2.0 is currently the primary standard used for generating Web documents.) During a document authoring stage, the HTML codes (referred to as “tags”) are embedded within the informational content of the document. When the Web document (or HTML document) is subsequently transferred from a Web server to a browser, the codes are interpreted by the browser and used to parse and display the document. Additionally in specifying how the Web browser is to display the document, HTML tags can be used to create links to other Web documents (commonly referred to as “hyperlinks”).” This discussion is limited to a general discussion of HTML and the use of tags in HTML documents.

Claim 21 has been further amended to recite that the control elements have a LINK relationship. This distinction is not found in Melet. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 21 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Melet.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103**

**The Office Action rejected claim 32 under 35 USC 103(a)**, as being unpatentable over Melet in view of US Pub 20040001476 to Islam et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because claim 32 is dependent on claim 21 which contains limitations not found in either Melet or Islam.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending

claims. The Director is hereby authorized to charge the one-month petition for extension of time fee under §1.17 to Deposit Account Number 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Buchenhorner/

Michael J. Buchenhorner  
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: September 2, 2009

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.  
8540 S.W. 83 Street  
Miami, Florida 33143  
(305) 273-8007 (voice)  
(305) 595-9579 (fax)